Pg. 138

Understanding the Villain

Shri. Yalaraj repeatedly avers that he would not care to discuss ethics, the code of morality, the mode of conduct in the world, etc. First, he says, there are plenty of other people who have both the training and the inclination and the time to discuss such matters in depth and at length. He would, himself, keep away from the subject altogether except, of course, one must undeniably obey the laws of the land and in one's actions avoid to the extent possible, hurting anyone. Apart from this very general, universally acceptable standard of conduct and morality, he would avoid any discussion on the finer points of the subject essentially because, he says, the standard and criterion regarding morality and conduct has been changing according to the times and the circumstances. He himself would rather deal with the true nature of man himself. Once one understands, apprehends and KNOWS one's true identity, the rest loses almost all its significance and importance.

This view and attitude of Shri Yalaraj is found to be extremely difficult to accept, certainly by the new visitors who perhaps feel that Shri Yalaraj is shying away from the very crux of the problem of life, but also by some persons who have visited and listened to Shri Yalaraj over a period. They find it impossible to imagine a dichotomy from the two: whatever conclusion and conviction one may come to regarding one's true nature, how can one afford not to give as much or even more thought to one's relationship with and behaviour towards our fellow-beings?! So, apropos of this subject which Shri. Yalaraj mentioned at a session, one of the regular visitors could not restrain himself from asking a very pointed question: "Shri. Yalaraj, would it by right and proper for a person to listen to you most attentively, understand thoroughly what you have to say to the

extent that he becomes a dugpaii, and then to go out and prepare an atom bomb and use it if he felt like it?"

Shri. Y always promptly replied: "If you had only thought seriously about this matter with discrimination, keeping in mind the basic fact that you had no wants, no needs, no problems at a certain point of time, say, a hundred years ago, you would have arrived at the answer yourself, the answer being that the question itself is misconceived.

"If, as you say, the person understands his true identity to the extent of being a dugpaii - even on this point I shall speak further a little later - would he not have come to the conclusion that all phenomena, including all sentient beings, are nothing but conceptual images in mind, as visionary as any dream?! Would someone who has deeply appreciated this case to go and prepare an atom bomb?

"But this is really a superficial answer. What you must find out is who - or what - is this 'I', 'you' and 'him' that we are talking about, who are supposed to be doing this or that according to their sweet will and pleasure! How do you consider yourself? You see a body, or really a part of it, and you identify yourself with it. But in deep sleep or sedation you do not identify yourself even with this body. What really happens is that the appearance of your body in consciousness is perceived and interpreted by you exactly as it is by some other observer. Your own interpretation about yourself is as visionary as those of others but almost certainly more flattering. The point to be noted is that what you think about yourself as a solid personality is nothing more than an appearance in consciousness. What is more, the interpretation will change from time to time. Is there any image about yourself

which is
~~is~~ changeless and permanent? Any thought about yourself, whether your own or someone else's, is only a movement in the consciousness, only a mental image: that is all that you are, as you consider yourself. But is that really you? — only a mental image? Is any other sentient being, similarly, only a mental image? Is there really any ~~in entity~~ image with which one should identify oneself as an independent, autonomous entity with choice of action?

"Is the position clear? Relatively — phenomenally — 'you' or 'me' is nothing more than that speck of physical matter which was conceived in a womb, within which is latent the spark of consciousness which is immanent in the entire manifestation. The innumerable forms of phenomena, in relativity, are all objects of the Absolute Subjectivity — I —, the basis of manifestation being duality through a subject and object, every object being the 'other' to whichever ~~subject~~ object that is perceiving it as a supposed subject. Not a single object has any independent existence as such: we are all mere ~~"thoughts projected"~~: appearances, concepts in a divided mind, each sentient being, being nothing more than his own concepts and those of whom he considers as 'others'.

"If we have no independent existence, how do ~~he~~ you act? Do you really act? — or do you really react to an outside stimulus, like a puppet? If you would only sit still and ~~let~~ see what really happens, you would quickly realise that we ~~are~~ do not really 'live' but are 'being lived'; that life as such is nothing more than what might be called an apparent functioning — apparent because all the functioning is, again, nothing more than an appearance in consciousness; if there is no consciousness ~~here~~ as in deep sleep or under a sedative, there is no functioning.

"Then where do we come in in all this

functioning? That is the ultimate joke in this comedy of Maya! 'We' have not only never been out of it, but the entire functioning is nothing but us. What we ARE is the whole, holy, nonmental Absolute, sensorially imperceptible, perceived and cognised only in relative duality, as relative manifested phenomena. 'We' are transcendence phenomenally as 'I', and immanence nonmenally. There is nothing but 'I', no 'me' no 'other'. In relative manifestation, phenomena are conceptualised in consciousness as 'me', and each object, assuming subjective identity, cognises the other objects as 'other'.

Now let us come back to your atom bomb. If you have really perceived this, is it possible for you to go on thinking any longer that there is any villain in life, with an independent autonomous entity, possessing enormous power for 'evil' or that there is another entity, an avatar, possessing enormous power for 'good'?! Surely you must realise that 'good' and 'bad' are mere manifestations in duality, appearances in consciousness. Indeed, believing in and identifying oneself with an entity is all the 'bondage' there is, and realising that there can be no entity, separate from the functioning of Prakruti, is instant liberation.